REMARKS

Status of the Claims

 Claims 1-4 and 6-29 remain pending in the present application and Claim 5 having been previously canceled. No amendment to the claims or the application has been made in this response. Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 5 [sic] and 6-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mastering Microsoft Internet Information Server 4 by Peter Dyson (hereinafter "Dyson") in view of Gomez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,569 - hereinafter "Gomez") in view of Klemets et al. (U.S. Published Application No. 2001/0013068 - hereinafter "Klemets"). The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Dyson with the teaching of Gomez and Klemets, because slide display commands allow users to control the order of the slides, and time indexing the plurality of deltaframes and keyframes permits synchronization for display at the client computer at predetermined points corresponding to the timelines of the video stream (Office Action, page 4, lines 1-7). However, it should be apparent that the claims in the present application clearly define over the art cited, for the reasons noted below.

In the interest of reducing the complexity of the issues for the Examiner to consider in this response, the following discussion focuses on independent Claims 1, 9, 16, 20, and 24. The patentability of each remaining dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However, applicants' decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and each dependent claim should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's conclusion that these dependent claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the cited references. Similarly, applicants' decision not to discuss differences between the prior art and every claim element, or every comment made by the Examiner, should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's interpretation and assertions regarding those claims. Indeed, applicants believe that all of the dependent claims patentably distinguish over the references cited. However, a specific traverse of the rejection of each dependent claim is not required, since dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend.

///

30 || ///

<u>Independent Claim 1 – step (a)</u>

With regard to step (a) of independent Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Gomez teaches generating slide display commands corresponding to said slide triggering events captured in real time during the presentation when presented live, for controlling display of said plurality of presentation slides (Office Action, page 3, lines 17-19). The Examiner references Figure 4 and column 7, lines 35 to 60. However, applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. Having reviewed this reference, it appears that Gomez does NOT teach or suggest the generation of slide display commands, or the generation of a slide display command that corresponds to the slide triggering event, or that the generation of a slide display command corresponding to slide triggering events is performed for the purpose of controlling display of the plurality of presentation slides.

It may be helpful to explain how these elements of Claim 1 relate to a preferred embodiment that is disclosed in the specification of the present application. First, in regard to "slide display commands," applicants disclose and claim the generation of slide display commands, and the slide display commands are defined in the specification as comprising HTML script commands, as follows:

In addition to providing the ASF streaming content to the attendees' computers, the system also coordinates the display of the HTML presentation slide files on the attendees' computers so that each slide is displayed and animated in conjunction with the display and animation of the slide during the live broadcast. This function is performed by *slide display commands* (i.e., *HTML script commands*) that are generated in real-time and embedded into the ASF stream. The slide script commands are decoded in the attendees' computers to cause an appropriate slide display and/or animation to occur in synchrony with the live presentation. Further details of this process are described below. (Emphasis added; see applicants' specification, page 29, lines 20-27.)

In contrast, Gomez teaches the generation of JPEG files and a corresponding HTML file and a URL, none of which are equivalent to HTML script commands. Specifically, Gomez discloses that during replay broadcasts, the web server retrieves and forwards the stored ASF file from storage and also accesses the stored HMTL documents and retrieves and forwards the stored JPEG documents as described above with respect to live streaming operation (Gomez, column 7, lines 50-60). And as described in relation to FIGURE 2 of Gomez, the still image control is automated to cause the still image grabber and converter to create a JPEG image of the still video source (Gomez, column 5, lines 36-38). In addition, a corresponding wrapping HTML file is created by an HTML and URL generator (Gomez, column 5, lines 43-45).

Furthermore, the HTML filename is sent as a relative URL from the generator to the encoder and streamer for inclusion in the encoded streaming video data (Gomez, column 5, lines 50-55). So when a URL is detected, for example in the form of a Script Command Object, by the ASF player, the web browser uses the URL to request the HTML documents, and once access is provided to the HTML document, the JPEG file name is extracted and retrieved from storage and sent to the browser that displays the JPEG image at the appropriate time (Gomez, column 7, lines 35-49). Thus, Gomez does not generate slide display commands that are defined as HTML slide commands embedded in the ASF stream, but instead generates JPEG file retrieval commands.

Second, Gomez does not teach or suggest that a slide display command corresponds to a slide triggering event. Applicants' specification teaches that:

As discussed above, it is necessary to advance the presentation of the various slide show slides on the attendees' computers from a remote machine. In order to perform virtual scenarios such as a one-to-many presentation, a presenter must be able to remotely execute commands on the audience machines to advance the presentation or to execute animation effects. For example, if two users browse the same web page, they are viewing two distinct copies of the same web page. In order for one user to control the web page viewed by the other, some communication needs to occur between them. The communication is accomplished through a combination of two technologies: embedding script commands in an ASF stream, and animations in the POWERPOINT HTML files (i.e., the cached presentation slides). POWERPOINT is thus able to send events via an audio/video stream to the online attendee, and the *events trigger commands* on the attendee's computer that effect actions on the web pages displayed on the attendee's computer.

As shown in FIGURE 19, the process begins in a block 1500, wherein a user executes commands in POWERPOINT, such as triggering the next animation. This step generates an event, which is captured using the application object model and converted to a syntax that can be inserted in an ASF format, as indicated by a block 1502. The syntax for the format is generally of the form: Label Parameter, where the number of Parameters after Label are generally unrestricted. In the case of POWERPOINT animations, the syntax is of the form PPTCMD 1 1. (Emphasis added; see applicants' specification, page 38, lines 9-27.)

Thus, for example, as indicated above, a slide triggering event may be the execution of an animation command. In contrast, Gomez's slide display commands do not correspond to slide triggering events but appear to correspond to a timed interval. Specifically, Gomez discloses that, taking JEG files as an exemplary output, "each JPEG file produced by the still image grabber and converter portion 21 represents a freezing of the digital video data received from video grabber card in order to produce at a *desired point in time*, a still image associated with the video being recorded by the still video camera 11." (Emphasis added,

Gomez, column 4, lines 49-53.) Gomez further teaches that "In addition, the still image control can be automated according to principles of the invention to cause the still image grabber and converter to *periodically create* a JPEG image of the still video source." (Gomez, column 5, lines 36-39.) Thus, Gomez does not teach or suggest that there is any correspondence between the display of an image and a specific slide triggering event.

Finally, the preamble of applicants' Claim 1 indicates that the claim is directed to "a method for recording a live presentation including a predefined content portion that includes a plurality of presentation slides." Step (a) of Claim 1 indicates that slide display commands corresponding to the slide triggering events are generated for the purpose of controlling display of *the plurality of presentation slides* during playback of a recorded presentation. Although Gomez discloses in the abstract that a live movie of a speaker together with the slide show can be viewed interactively within the same video display screen or that the complete production can be stored on a hard drive for retrieval on demand, Gomez does not teach or suggest that an actual slide show that the speaker originally presented is replayed. Instead, Gomez discloses that the still image grabber processes the video of the slide show by grabbing images, which are converted into JPEG files in real time during the presentation (Gomez, column 3, lines 37-40). Thus, during replay broadcasts, the web browser that receives the ASF file and the JPEG documents, synchronously integrates the "still" video images into the "live" video stream (Gomez, column 7, lines 57-60). Thus, unlike applicants claimed invention, which displays the same plurality of presentation of slides during playback as was presented in the live presentation, during playback, Gomez merely displays a series of still pictures grabbed from the original presentation.

Independent Claim 9

With regard to independent Claim 9, which is directed towards a method for reproducing on a viewing computer a presentation that was previously presented live, because the prior art does not teach or suggest the generation of a slide display command that corresponds to the slide triggering event and does not teach that the slide display command controls display of a presentation slide, even an *associated* presentation slide, this claim is patentably distinguishable over Dyson in view of Gomez and in view of Klemets for reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with applicants' traverse of the rejection of Claim 1.

29 || //

30 | ///

2345

6 7 8

10 11

12

9

13 14 15

17 18 19

16

202122

2324

25

26

27

28

29

30

Independent Claim 16 and Claim 20

With regard to independent Claims 16 and 20, which are directed towards a system for recording a live presentation including a predefined content portion having a plurality of presentation slides that are displayed in response to slide triggering events during the live presentation, because the prior art does not teach or suggest the generation of a slide display command that corresponds to a slide triggering event, these claims are also patentably distinguishable over Dyson in view of Gomez and in view of Klemets for reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with applicants' traverse of the rejection of Claim 1.

Independent Claim 24

With regard to amended independent Claim 24, which is directed towards a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for recording a live presentation having a predefined content portion, because the prior art does not teach or suggest the generation of a slide display command that corresponds to the slide triggering event and does not teach that the slide display command controls display of any presentation slide, this claim is patentably distinguishable over Dyson in view of Gomez and in view of Klemets for reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with applicants' Claim 1.

Furthermore, Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-15, 17-19, 21-23, and 25-29 depend from independent Claims 1, 9, 16, 20, and 24, which are patentable for the reasons discussed above. Because dependent claims inherently include all of the steps or elements of the independent claim from which the dependent claims depend, dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-15, 17-19, 21-23 and 25-29 are patentable for at least the same reasons as independent Claims 1, 9, 16, 20, and 24. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-15, 17-19, 21-23, and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Dyson in view of Gomez in view of Klemets should be withdrawn.

-15-

///

///

; || *||*//

| ///

///

In consideration of the amendments and Remarks set forth above, it will be apparent that the claims remaining in this application define a novel and non-obvious invention, and that the application is in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue without further delay. Should any further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

n anderson

Kathy Parli

Ronald M. Anderson Registration No. 28,829

RMA/SKM:lrg

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 8, 2005.

Date: April 8, 2005

MS 113937.03 MICR0173-1-1\0173AM 04-08-2005.doc